

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 stand rejected. Claims 1-34 remain pending in this patent application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments herein to this patent application do not add new matter to it.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 15, 17-19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 32 and 34 of the present application are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bentley, US Patent Number 6,591,094 (hereinafter Bentley), in view of Pepe et al., US Patent Number 5,742,905 (hereinafter Pepe). Additionally, Claims 7, 16, 26-28 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bentley and Pepe in view of Kim et al., US Patent Number 6,118,926. Claims 11-14, 20-23 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bentley in view of Pepe in further view of Mahany et al., US Patent Number 5,657,317.

CLAIM 1

Applicants respectfully contend that the Bentley and Pepe references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest subject matter recited in amended independent Claim 1. For instance, newly amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

a portable computing device that uses a radio frequency (RF) technology for wirelessly transmitting a control signal based on an occurrence of a scheduled time and date;

* * *

wherein said portable computing device remotely triggers said device to perform said action.

Applicants respectfully assert that Bentley and Pepe, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a portable computing device that remotely triggers a device to perform an action as specifically recited in amended Claim 1. Specifically, Bentley and Pepe, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a portable computing device that wirelessly transmits a control signal based on an occurrence of a scheduled time and date.

Since Bentley and Pepe, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element of amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that amended Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Bentley and Pepe. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 is allowable over Bentley and Pepe.

CLAIMS 15 and 29

Based on rationale similar to that discussed above with reference to newly amended independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that newly amended independent Claims 15 and 29 are also not rendered obvious by Bentley and Pepe, alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 15 and 29 are allowable over Bentley and Pepe.

CLAIM 10

Applicants respectfully contend that the subject matter of amended dependent Claim 10 is not rendered obvious by Bentley and Pepe, alone or in combination, based on the same rationale discussed above for amended independent Claim 1 from which Claim 10 depends.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Bentley and Pepe, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest subject matter recited in amended dependent Claim 10. For instance, newly amended Claim 10 recites in part (emphasis added):

wherein said portable computing device for alarming before wirelessly transmitting said control signal to trigger said device to perform said action.

Applicants respectfully contend that Bentley and Pepe, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a portable computing device that alarms before wirelessly transmitting the control signal to trigger the device to perform the action as specifically recited in amended Claim 10.

Since Bentley and Pepe, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one element of amended Claim 10, Applicants respectfully contend that amended Claim 10 is not rendered obvious by the Bentley and Pepe references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended dependent Claim 10 is allowable over Bentley and Pepe.

CLAIM 19

Based on rationale similar to that discussed above with reference to newly amended dependent Claim 10, Applicants respectfully contend that newly amended dependent Claim 19 is also not rendered obvious by Bentley and Pepe, alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended dependent Claim 19 is allowable over Bentley and Pepe.



CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-34.

Based on the reasoning presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that amended Claims 1-34 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: MAY 17, 2004

Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Voice: (408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069

RECEIVED

MAY 21 2004

Technology Center 2600